

REMARKS

The above-identified patent application has been amended and Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to reconsider and again examine the claims as amended.

Claims 1-17 are pending in the application. Claims 1-9 are rejected. Claims 1, 4, 7, and 8 are amended herein. Claims 10-14 are new.

In accordance with the revised provisions of 37 C.F.R. §1.121(c) as enacted on July 30, 2003, a marked up version of specification paragraphs and claims is provided hereinabove.

As an initial matter, the Examiner asserts that "information statements filed January 7, 1002 (paper #4), March 19, 2002 (paper #5), and May 17, 2002 (paper #6), are missing from the file." The Examiner requests a copy of these disclosures.

Applicant respectfully reminds the Examiner of a telephone call between the Examiner and the undersigned attorney on September 10, 2003, in which the missing IDSs were discussed, and in which the undersigned attorney suggested that six information disclosures, rather than three, have not been returned to the Applicants with the Examiners initials and signature. The six missing information disclosures are identified below. The Examiner agreed to obtain the US patents disclosed in those information disclosure statements and the undersigned attorney agreed to provide the information disclosures, the cited foreign patents, and the cited papers, copies of which are attached hereto.

Upon the Examiner's review of the attached information disclosures, the Examiner agreed that an additional fee would not be necessary if the Examiner determines that the attached information disclosures were filed in accordance with paragraphs not requiring a fee under paragraphs of 37 C.F.R. 1.97 as indicated in the attached information disclosures, or that the information disclosures were originally filed with a fee.

In accordance with the above remarks, Applicants cannot identify that signed and initialed information disclosure forms have been returned as identified below. Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner provide the signed and initialed information disclosure forms as indicated and as submitted again herewith.

Submitted with certificate of mailing dated December 17, 2001;

Submitted with certificate of mailing dated March 11, 2002;

Submitted with certificate of mailing dated May 3, 2002;

Submitted with certificate of mailing dated May 10, 2002;

Submitted with certificate of mailing dated May 16, 2002; and

Submitted with certificate of mailing dated June 17, 2002.

The Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §102(e)

The Examiner rejects Claims 1-3 and 7-8 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Hsu et al. (US patent number 6,297,732)

Applicants have amended Claim 1 in form only, to correct antecedent basis.

Applicants submit that Claim 1 is patentably distinct over Hsu et al., since the cited reference neither describes nor suggests "... a radar transceiver portably attached to a vehicle," as set forth in Claim 1.

With this particular arrangement, as described at page 2, line 29 to page 3 line 6, the present invention provides "... a radar transceiver portably attached to the vehicle...that is adaptable to any vehicle during or after manufacture of the vehicle."

Applicants respectfully direct the Examiner's attention to the IEEE Authoritative Dictionary of IEEE Standard Terms, hereafter called the IEEE dictionary. The IEEE dictionary defines a "transceiver" as a "combination of radio transmitting and receiving equipment in a common housing." A similar definition can be found in Webster's II New College Dictionary, dated 2001, in which the word "transceiver" is defined as a "module

composed of a radio receiver and transmitter." Applicants submit that the term "transceiver" should be construed in accordance with its ordinary meaning, i.e., as an electronic module capable of both transmitting and receiving radio energy.

Hsu et al. merely provides a "[r]adar/laser detector 11 ...adapted for standard early warning detection of radar and/or laser-emitted signals used by such as law enforcement traffic officers..." Therefore, Applicant submits that Hsu et al. teaches only a radar receiver, for example a radar receiver capable of receiving a radar signal emitted by a police radar as used by a police office for speed detection of a passing vehicle, not the claimed radar transceiver portably mounted of the present invention.

In view of the above, Applicants submit that Claim 1 is patentably distinct over Hsu et al.

Claims 2-3, 7, and 8 depend from and thus include the limitations of Claim 1. Thus, Applicants submit that Claims 2-3, 7 and 8 are patentably distinct over the cited reference generally for the reasons discussed above in conjunction with Claim 1.

Claims 7 and 8 are amended herein to remedy missing punctuation. For substantially the same reasons described above in conjunction with Claim 1, it is submitted that Claim 7 is further patentably distinct over Hsu et al., since the cited reference neither describes nor suggests "...the radar transceiver is portably attached to the interior of the vehicle," as set forth in Claim 7. Similarly, it is submitted that Claim 8 is further patentably distinct over Hsu et al., since the cited reference neither describes nor suggests "...the radar transceiver is portably attached to the exterior of the vehicle," as set forth in Claim 8.

In view of the above, Applicants submit that the rejection of Claims 1-3, and 7-8 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) should be removed.

The Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Hsu et al. in View of Bell et al.

The Examiner rejects Claims 4, 5, and 9 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Hsu et al. in view of Bell et al. (US patent number 6,232,910). With regard to Claims 4, 5, and 9, the Examiner recognizes that Hsu et al. does not describe "...a display that can be portably attached to the exterior of the vehicle... ." The Examiner relies upon Bell et al. to teach a vehicle radar system having "...displays...provided outside of the vehicle." The Examiner concludes that "...it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art...to incorporate the teaching, disclosed by Bell, by placing the display on the exterior of the vehicle."

As the Examiner is aware, and as found in MPEP §2142, in order to establish a prima facie case of obviousness "...the prior art reference (or prior art references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations." Applicants respectfully submit that the Examiner has not met this burden in order to establish prima facie obviousness.

Applicants submit that Claims 4, 5, and 9 are patentably distinct over Hsu et al., whether taken alone or in combination with Bell et al., since the cited references neither describe nor suggest "... a radar transceiver portably attached to a vehicle," as required by Claims 4, 5, and 9.

With this particular arrangement, as described at page 2, line 29 to page 3 line 6, the present invention provides "... a radar transceiver portably attached to the vehicle...that is adaptable to any vehicle during or after manufacture of the vehicle."

Applicants respectfully direct the Examiner's attention to the IEEE Authoritative Dictionary of IEEE Standard Terms, hereafter called the IEEE dictionary. The IEEE dictionary defines a "transceiver" as a "combination of radio transmitting and receiving equipment in a common housing." A similar definition can be found in Webster's II New College Dictionary, dated 2001, in which the word "transceiver" is defined as a "module composed of a radio receiver and transmitter." Applicants submit that the term "transceiver" should be construed in accordance with its ordinary meaning, i.e., as an electronic module capable of both transmitting and receiving radio energy.

In contrast, Hsu et al. merely provides a "[r]adar/laser detector 11 ...adapted for standard early warning detection of radar and/or laser-emitted signals used by such as law enforcement traffic officers... ." (column 1, lines 23-26) Therefore, Applicant submits that Hsu et al. teaches only a radar receiver, for example a radar receiver capable of receiving a radar signal emitted by a police radar as used by a police office for speed detection of a passing vehicle, not the claimed radar transceiver portably mounted of the present invention.

Applicants submit that Bell et al. fails to overcome the above deficiency in Hsu et al. Bell et al. describes a vehicle radar system having radar sensors 202, 204 and 206 each comprising a radar transmitter and receiver circuit. Bell et al. describes at column 9, lines 1-18 that the radar sensors can be placed at selected fixed locations about a vehicle. Therefore, Applicants submit that Bell et al. also neither describes nor suggests the claimed radar transceivers portably mounted to the vehicle.

Furthermore, Applicants have amended Claim 4 hereinto to require "...the radar display is portably attached to the exterior of the vehicle so as to be visible to an occupant of the vehicle." Support for this amendment can be found at page 5, lines 27-29.

Applicants submit that Claim 4 is further patentably distinct over Hsu et al., whether taken alone or in combination with Bell et al., since the cited references neither describe nor suggest "...the radar display is portably attached to the exterior of the vehicle so as to be visible to an occupant of the vehicle," as set forth in amended Claim 4.

In contrast, as recognized by the Examiner, Hsu et al. describes at column 3, lines 27-28, that "[d]etector unit 11 may be mounted at any convenient location in a vehicle... ," and therefore, not portably attached to the exterior of the vehicle so as to be visible to an occupant of the vehicle as claimed. Bell et al. fails to overcome this deficiency in Hsu et al. Bell describes at column 10, lines 30-31 "[t]he display may also be provided outside of the vehicle to warn people behind the vehicle."

Appl. No. 09/931,276
Reply to Office Action of August 5, 2003

Docket No. RTN-122PUS

In view of the above, Applicants submit that Claims 4, 5, and 9 are patentably distinct over Hsu et al, whether taken alone or in combination with Bell et al.

In View of Hsu et al.

The Examiner rejects Claim 6 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Hsu et al.

For substantially the same reasons described above in conjunction with Claims 4, 5, and 9, Applicants submit that Claim 6 is patentably distinct over Hsu et al. since the cited reference neither describes nor suggests "... a radar transceiver portably attached to a vehicle," as required by Claim 6.

In view of the above, Applicants submit that Claim 6 is patentably distinct over Hsu et al.

Therefore, in view of the above, Applicants submit that the rejection of Claims 4-6 and 9 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) should be removed.

Claims 10-14 are new in the application. Claims 10-14 depend from and thus include the limitations of Claim 1. Thus, it is submitted that Claims 10-14 are allowable over the cited references of record in this case generally for the reasons discussed above in conjunction with Claim 1.

In view of the above amendment and remarks, Applicants submit that Claims 1-14 and the entire case are in condition for allowance and should be sent to issue and such action is respectfully requested.

The Examiner is respectfully invited to telephone the undersigning attorney if there are any questions regarding this Amendment or this application.

The Assistant Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge payment of any additional fees associated with this communication or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 500845.

Dated: Nov 25, 2003

Respectfully submitted,

DALY, CROWLEY & MOFFORD, LLP

By: Kermit Robinson
Kermit Robinson
Reg. No. 48,734
Attorney for Applicant(s)
275 Turnpike Street, Suite 101
Canton, MA 02021-2354
Tel.: (781) 401-9988, ext. 24
Fax: (781) 401-9966

Q:\rtn\122pus (00E156 SOD)\rtn-122pus resp to OA of 2003 08 25.doc